Industrial Problems 2:18



# COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

## AN ETHICAL EVALUATION OF SOME PHASES OF TRADE UNIONISM AND THE OPEN SHOP MOVEMENT

BY

KIRBY PAGE

AUTHOR OF "THE SWORD OR THE CROSS," "INDUSTRIAL FACTS," "SOMETHING MORE," ETC.

NEW YORK
GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

*Ten Cents Net.*

COPYRIGHT, 1921,
BY GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

# CONTENTS


| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I: | THE PRINCIPLE OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING | 5 |
| | Attitude in England | 6 |
| | Protection of the Workers | 7 |
| | The United States Steel Corporation | 7 |
| | Collective Action Necessary | 9 |
| | Benevolent Employers | 10 |
| | Present Inefficiency of Industry | 11 |
| | Morale | 12 |
| | Increased Efficiency | 14 |
| | Autocracy and Efficiency | 16 |
| II: | THE UNION SHOP | 17 |
| | Concentration of Control | 17 |
| | Objections to the Union Shop | 19 |
| III: | THE OPEN SHOP MOVEMENT | 21 |
| | Words of Disapproval | 21 |
| | Refusal of Recognition | 23 |
| | Spies and Intimidation | 23 |
| | The Folly of Repression | 24 |
| | Tendency in America | 26 |
| | Dealing with Faults of Unions | 27 |
| IV: | THE APPLICATION OF CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES | 29 |

# AUTHOR'S NOTE

The subject of collective bargaining is of extraordinary importance. It is the heart of the present industrial struggle in the United States. Vast issues are at stake: the stability and prosperity of industry; the wages, hours, status and morale of the workers; the living conditions of a large proportion of our population—all these will be vitally affected by the decisions reached concerning collective bargaining.

This subject deserves the special interest and understanding of all who are concerned with moral and spiritual values. The development of personality, the enjoyment of abundant life, and the maintenance of high moral standards, are profoundly affected by such material considerations as insufficient income, excessively long hours, insecurity of employment, and the class struggle.

It is, of course, impossible to give an adequate treatment of such a vital theme within 32 pages. The present writer has attempted to outline briefly the major issues and to emphasize what seem to him to be the most important points. He has endeavored to be accurate and fair in his presentation of the faults of employers and union leaders alike. If he has placed primary emphasis upon the policies of one side it is because he is convinced that the burden of responsibility for our present confusion should be attributed to that group.

It is hoped that this pamphlet may be found useful for personal study and in classes, discussion groups and open forums.

KIRBY PAGE.

*December 15, 1921.*
*311 Division Avenue,*
*Hasbrouck Heights, New Jersey.*

# I: THE PRINCIPLE OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The necessity and value of collective action by workers is being recognized by an increasing number of business men, statesmen, professors and church leaders. The Final Report of the Federal Commission on Industrial Relations says: "It is very significant that out of 230 representatives of the interests of employers, chosen largely on the recommendation of their own organizations, less than half a dozen have denied the propriety of collective action on the part of employees." [1] President Wilson's Second Industrial Conference went on record as "being in favor of the policy of collective bargaining." [2] The United States War Labor Board declared that: "The right of workers to organize in trade unions and to bargain collectively through chosen representatives is recognized and affirmed. This right shall not be denied, abridged, or interfered with by the employers in any manner whatsoever."[3]

The United States Senate Committee on the Steel Strike declared that: "The Committee is agreed that the principle of collective bargaining is a right of men working in industry." [4] In an address before the American Engineering Societies, Mr. Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce, said: "In the question of industrial conflict resulting in lockout and strike, one mitigating measure has been agreed upon in principle by all sections of the community. That is collective bargaining, by which, wherever possible, the parties should settle their difficulties before they start a fight. It is founded not only on the sense of prevention but on the human right to consolidate the worker in a proper balanced position to uphold his rights against the consolidation of capital." [5] Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Secretary of State, says: "I

[1] Final Report of the Commission on Industrial Relations, Senate Document No. 415. 64th Congress, p. 64.
[2] Report of the President's Industrial Conference, p. 31.
[3] United States National War Labor Board, Report of the Secretary, 1919, p. 52, 53.
[4] U. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Education and Labor. Investigating strike in steel industry. 66th Congress, 1st session, Report No. 289, p. 16.
[5] Quoted in the *American Federationist,* Jan., 1921, p. 38.

trust there will be no more struggles in futile opposition to the right of collective bargaining on the part of employees." [1]

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America declares that: "An ordered and constructive democracy in industry is as necessary as political democracy and that collective bargaining and the sharing of shop control and management are inevitable steps in its attainment." The resolution passed by the Congregational Church in national session at Grand Rapids in 1919 says: "We believe that the general interest of the wage-earners is best promoted by collective bargaining, and we acknowledge the right of wage-earners to organize without discrimination, to bargain collectively." The Methodist Episcopal Bishops of the United States declared that: "We favor collective bargaining as an instrument for the attainment of industrial justice and for training in democratic procedure." The National Catholic War Council has issued a statement in which it says it is to be hoped that the right of collective bargaining "will never again be called in question." The Social Justice Program adopted by the Central Conference of American Rabbis "recognizes the right of labor to organize and to bargain collectively through representatives of its own choosing."

## ATTITUDE IN ENGLAND

In England the validity of collective bargaining was recognized nearly half a century ago. Concerning the two Acts of 1875, Mr. Sidney Webb says: "Collective bargaining, in short, with all its necessary accompaniments, was, after fifty years of legislative struggle, finally recognized by the law of the land." [2] In England today collective bargaining is regarded as a matter of course and its validity is not questioned. In this connection, Mr. Webb says: "This practice of collective bargaining has, in one form or another, superseded the old individual contract between master and servant over a very large proportion of the industrial field." [3]

Underlying these statements concerning the value and necessity of collective bargaining is the realization of certain fundamental facts. A clear understanding of these vital issues will aid us in determining our attitude toward trade unionism and the open shop movement.

[1] Quoted in "The Trade Union as the Basis for Collective Bargaining," presented by W. Jett Lauck before the United States Anthracite Coal Commission, 1920, p. 13.

[2] Sidney and Beatrice Webb, "History of Trades Unions" (revised edition, 1920), p. 291.

[3] Sidney and Beatrice Webb, "Industrial Democracy" (1914), p. 177.

## PROTECTION OF THE WORKERS

The first of these fundamental convictions is that collective action is necessary for the protection of the workers. Chief Justice Taft recently declared: "The principle of combination among workingmen is indispensable to their welfare and their protection against the tyranny of employers." [1]

There may have been a time when the individual worker could bargain on an equal basis with his employer. There are doubtless still many small shops in which the employer and his few workmen are on a relatively equal basis of bargaining power. Workers in small plants may be able to look after their own interests by individual bargaining and may feel no need of collective action.

Several million American workers, however, are confronted with an entirely different situation. They are employed by the hundred or by the thousand in a given mine or plant or shop. Their employer is not an individual only slightly better off financially than his workmen. For hundreds of thousands of American workmen their employer is a huge corporation with invested capital running into the millions of dollars and with enormous reserves and credit power. In many instances control of the welfare of tens of thousands of employees is vested in a small Board of Directors in a distant city. Such directors often judge the success of the managerial staff by the rate of the annual dividend. Under such circumstances it is sheer stupidity to say that the individual workman can bargain on an equal basis with such a huge concentration of capital. In such a case there is no bargain at all, the individual worker can accept the conditions offered by the corporation or seek other employment. He has not the slightest power individually to change the offer of the corporation. Without collective action on their part hundreds of thousands of American workmen are at the mercy of powerful combinations of capital.

## THE UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION

The seriousness of the situation will be emphasized if we consider a concrete case, that of the employees of the United States Steel Corporation. This huge corporation has a total capitalization of approximately a billion and a half dollars.[2] Its total undivided surplus is $523,454,890.89.[3] The number of individual stockholders in this corporation is more than 100,000, but a majority of the

[1] Philadelphia *Public Ledger*, January 22, 1921, p. 8.
[2] U. S. Steel Corporation. Annual Report, 1920, p. 33.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

stock is held by less than 2 per cent of the stockholders [1] and actual control is vested in thirteen directors. The degree of control exercised by the board of directors is revealed in a recent statement by Judge Elbert H. Gary, its chairman: "Some years ago, in 1912, I believe, Mr. Charles Cabot of Boston arose in a stockholders' meeting and proposed a committee to study the hours of work. I asked him how many shares he had. He replied that he had ten or twenty, I have forgotten which. I reminded him that as *I held the proxies of a majority of the voting shares* I could very easily outvote his motion. Nevertheless I was glad to vote for it, and so the committee was put in action." [2] That is to say, Judge Gary alone commanded sufficient votes to determine the policies of the United States Steel Corporation. The tens of thousands of small stockholders take no active part in the control of the policies and are, in any case, helpless to change the decisions of the small group of heavy stockholders.

In normal times approximately 200,000 workers are employed by the United States Steel Corporation. The corporation has consistently refused to bargain collectively with its workers. This is the corporation concerning which the Interchurch Report on the Steel Strike of 1919 said: "Approximately half of the employees in iron and steel manufacturing plants are subject to the schedule known as the twelve-hour day (that is a working day from 11 to 14 hours long). Less than one-quarter of the industry's employees can work under 60 hours a week." [3] The Steel Corporation boasts that it pays the standard rate of wages or slightly in advance of the standard rate. Its skilled workers are undoubtedly well paid, many of them earning from $10 to $20 per day. The Interchurch Report says: "Skilled steel labor was paid wages disproportionate to the earnings of the other two-thirds, thus binding the skilled class to the companies and creating divisions between the upper third and the rest of the force." This report also says: "The annual earnings of over one-third of all productive iron and steel workers were, and had been for years, below the level set by government experts as the minimum of subsistence standard for families of five. The annual earnings of 72 per cent of all workers were, and had been for years, below the level set by government experts as the minimum of comfort level for families of five. This second standard being the lowest which scientists are willing to term an 'American standard of living,' it follows that *nearly three-quarters of the steel workers could not earn enough for an American stand-*

[1] "Final Report of the Commission on Industrial Relations," p. 80.
[2] Quoted in *Collier's Weekly*, July 23, 1921, and in *Industry*, August 15, 1921, p. 6.
[3] "Report on the Steel Strike of 1919," p. 44.

*ard of living."* [1] And this in spite of the fact that tens of thousands of these workers were compelled to work the twelve-hour day and seven-day week.

On August 20, 1921, the United States Steel Corporation reduced the rate of wages of its employees, this being the third cut during 1921. The rate for unskilled laborers is now 30 cents an hour. Working 10 hours a day, six days every week, 52 weeks in the year, with no vacation or loss of time due to sickness or otherwise, such an employee earns $936 per year. Since the cost of living is still high, it is obviously impossible for a man to support a wife and family in decency and comfort on such an income. Even if he works 12 hours per day, with no loss of time, his annual income is only $1,123.30. This is several hundred dollars below the minimum health and decency budget.

Surely the case of the United States Steel Corporation reveals the need for a system of collective bargaining in the great industrial plants of the country. Remember the facts: Approximately half of the employees in iron and steel plants work the twelve-hour day, nearly three-fourths cannot earn enough for an American standard of living, yet the total undivided surplus of the corporation has increased from $135,204,471.90 in 1914 to $523,454,890.89 at the end of 1920.[2] Such facts are an unanswerable argument for a policy of collective bargaining for the protection of the workers.

## COLLECTIVE ACTION NECESSARY

The case of the United States Steel Corporation is not an exceptional one. There is concentration of control in many other industries, notably in mining, oil, meat packing, railways. In any of the larger plants of these industries the individual workman is helpless if he seeks to bargain single-handed. This is true also of the workman in a small shop where the owner is a member of an employers' association in which common policies are agreed upon. Collective action is essential if workmen are to receive adequate protection.

Experience has shown that it is not safe to leave the welfare of the workers exclusively in the hands of the employers. In many cases where the employer engages only a few workers, knows them intimately and deals with them personally, the workers receive adequate consideration. There are doubtless many employers with hundreds of workers where the interests of the workers are safeguarded. But after due allowance has been made for all such

[1] "Report on the Steel Strike of 1919," p. 85.
[2] U. S. Steel Corporation. Annual Report, 1920, p. 33.

cases, the fact still remains that the only adequate protection for hundreds of thousands of American workmen consists in their ability to bargain collectively.

After many years of intimate contact with great corporations, Mr. Samuel Untermeyer, one of the leading attorneys of the United States, felt constrained to say: "Capitalism is more powerful, more rampant, more despotic, and less controlled by law or public sentiment with us than in any other country. It lacks the most elemental sense of justice and fights every inch of the way regardless of the merits of the controversy." [1] After his experiences as attorney for the Lockwood Investigating Committee of the New York State Legislature, where he rendered conspicuous service, Mr. Untermeyer also said: "I am no alarmist, but my great fear is that the country either does not sufficiently realize or has become callous to the perils that lurk in the social unrest that is being accentuated by the greed and piracy of these combinations that infest the land from end to end. They are all-powerful. It is still possible to reach the little fellows, but the biggest and most dangerous of them apparently are already above and beyond the law as it now stands." [2]

## BENEVOLENT EMPLOYERS

Even if one is inclined to disagree with the picture of some capitalists painted by Mr. Untermeyer, the fact still remains that it is unsafe to leave masses of workers defenceless before entrenched capital. This is true even if the directors are benevolently inclined and are honestly seeking the welfare of the workers. History is filled with illustrations where men of undoubted good will have been unconscious of the sufferings of their employees or have taken it for granted that such suffering was inevitable and beyond hope of removal. During the early part of the 19th century, a cotton mill owner in England by the name of Mr. G. A. Lee, who was noted for his philanthropy, defended his action in compelling the children in his mills to work from six o'clock in the morning until eight o'clock in the evening by saying: "Nothing is more favorable to morals than habits of early subordination, industry and regularity." [3] A group of employers opposed the reducing of the working hours of children below thirteen hours a day, because "these hours agreed with the children wonderfully. Factory children were healthier, more intelligent, more moral than

[1] Quoted in the *Arbitrator*, April-May, 1921, p. 10.
[2] New York *World*, May 27, 1921.
[3] Quoted in J. L. and Barbara Hammond, "The Town Labourer," p. 163.

others." [1] Men and women who reasoned like this were not particularly heartless or cruel. They simply took the world as they found it. "The doctrine that poverty was inevitable and incurable put a soft pillow under the conscience of the ruling class." [2] Concerning many of the employers who compelled men, women and children to labor inhumanly long hours for less than a living wage, it has been said: "They were essentially scholars, men of taste and refinement, who enjoyed nothing more than talking about literature, the meaning of words, the ideas of writers, or history, or pictures, or travel." [3]

When it comes to the needs of the workers, the judgment of the employer alone is not to be trusted, no matter how benevolent or well intentioned he may be. Henry White says: "An employer who does not contend that he is paying as much as his business will allow would be a curiosity."

Let us go one step further. Even if an occasional benevolent employer does correctly gauge the needs of his workers and is able to protect them, such employers are hopelessly in the minority and the mass of workers are unprotected unless they band themselves together for collective action. "The problem," says Henry White, "is not a matter of the liberality of the individual employers, but of general conditions that can be improved only by a uniform upward pressure which the wage-worker himself must apply. In doing this he must encounter the opposition of employers, who naturally object to being disturbed, and who resent interferences with their time-honored prerogatives." [4]

The benevolent employer who is really desirous of helping his workers should remember that philanthropy is often bestowed in such a way as to weaken the capacity for self-help. Long ago we learned that certain kinds of charity do the poor much more harm than good. Charity wrongly administered may serve only to pauperize still further the recipient. In like manner, paternalistic welfare work may weaken the self-reliance of the workers. Surely the most effective way of advancing the permanent well-being of the workers is to help them to reach the place where they can provide for themselves.

## PRESENT INEFFICIENCY OF INDUSTRY

As conducted at the present time industry is grossly inefficient. Consider the facts. In the United States we have at our disposal countless inventions and machines which have enormously

[1] Hammond, p. 162.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 202.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 274.
[4] American Economic Association, "Proceedings," 4:173-182.

increased our productive capacity; we have an elaborate transportation system that enables us to convey our raw material and our finished products with great ease; we have uncounted thousands of highly skilled mechanics of all kinds; we have an abundant supply of labor power. With what result? All over the United States today there are thousands of business men who are on the verge of bankruptcy and who would go to the wall if seriously pressed by their creditors. More than four million workers are seeking in vain for employment. Thousands of families are in actual destitution through no fault of their own. Other thousands of families are only a few weeks removed from actual want. It is doubtful whether conditions at present are any better than in 1915 when the Commission on Industrial Relations found that "a large part of our industrial population are, as a result of the combination of low wages and unemployment, living in a condition of actual poverty. How large this proportion is can not be exactly determined, but it is certain that at least one-third and possibly one-half of the families of wage-earners employed in manufacturing and mining earn in the course of the year less than enough to support them in anything like a comfortable and decent condition. The terrible effects of such poverty may be outlined in a few paragraphs, but their far-reaching consequences could not be adequately shown in a volume." [1]

These are the facts: On the one hand, unbounded capacities of production; and on the other, poverty for many, insufficiency for others, danger of business failure for others. It does not require an expert to discover that somewhere along the line there is gross inefficiency. Opinions differ as to the source of the difficulty. No competent observer, however, attempts to deny that at the present time industry is inefficient.

## MORALE

Some people say that chief blame should be laid at the door of labor. It is said that workers are loafing on the job, indifferent as to the grade and degree of their work, and often guilty of deliberate restriction of output. One fact at least is clear: *the morale of many workers is at a low ebb.* Many workers are filled with fear and dread, feeling their helplessness to find continuous employment and to maintain a proper standard of life. Most workers fail to have a sense of responsibility for the success of the industry. They have little or no power to affect the policies and plans of the industry. They have no sufficient incentive to efficiency. The

[1] Senate Document No. 415, 64th Congress, pages 22, 23.

amount of income received by many workers for ten or twelve hours of daily toil is insufficient to maintain a decent and comfortable standard of living; they often live under circumstances wholly unfavorable to wholesome life; they often have an exaggerated idea as to the wealth of their employers and are keenly resentful and bitter against their employers and society in general. Such is the condition and attitude of hundreds of thousands of workers in the United States. Morale is badly shattered. It is useless to expect efficient production so long as such conditions and such attitudes prevail.

When it comes to suggestions as to ways and means of improving the morale of the workers, there is a great variety of opinion. Whatever else may be required, it seems certain that morale can not effectively and permanently be sustained without increasing the power and responsibility of the workers. This calls for some kind of collective action on their part. In this connection, Justice Brandeis says: "My observation leads me to believe that while there are many single things—single causes—contributing causes to unrest, that there is one cause which is fundamental, and it is the necessary conflict between—the contrast between—our political liberty and the industrial absolutism. The end to which we must move is a recognition of industrial democracy as the end to which we are to work, and that means this: it means that problems are not any longer, or to be any longer, the problems of the employer." [1]

Mr. Wm. B. Dickson, Vice-President of the Midvale Steel & Ordnance Co., bears similar testimony: "I believe that one of the first steps necessary to inspire the workmen with confidence in the sincerity of the employers' recognition of the proper status of labor, is the adoption of a fair system of collective bargaining." [2]

President Wilson, in his Message to Congress, of May 20, 1919, pleaded for "the genuine democratization of industry, based upon a full recognition of the right of those who work, in whatever rank, to participate in some organic way in every decision which directly affects their welfare or the part they are to play in industry."

Morale is the great factor in the efficiency of workers. With the spread of education and democratic ideas, workers will never render their best service so long as they are unprotected and unrepresented in the control of the conditions of their working lives. Morale is necessary to efficient production. In the case of many workers, collective bargaining is necessary to morale.

[1] "Final Report of the Commission on Industrial Relations," p. 63.
[2] "Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science," Sept., 1919, p. 24.

## INCREASED EFFICIENCY

One of the chief objections raised by those employers who are opposed to collective bargaining is that it decreases efficiency in production. Hundreds of employers all over the United States, however, have demonstrated conclusively that collective bargaining makes for increased production. Impressive evidence of this character was recently presented before the United States Railroad Labor Board.[1] This evidence cites many instances of satisfactory trade agreements reached by collective bargaining in many industries.

As an illustration of the attitude of many employers, Mr. Grange Sard, a prominent stove manufacturer of Albany, is quoted: "I have been through the mill, so to speak. I have fought the union. I have thought it was to the interest of the manufacturer to destroy the union. But I have been shown the error of my way, and I am prepared to say now and have thought for many years that it is the wise employer who encourages rather than discourages unionism. The Stove Manufacturers' Defence Association was organized in 1886 for the purpose of fighting the union, of resisting what we termed unjust demands. We had our fight with the Union, and at the end we each had more respect for the power and fighting qualities of the other, so that in 1891 we had a conference committee appointed representing six employees and six employers. They drew up an agreement which should fix the rate of wages and conditions in shop for the current year. Since 1891, we have had no strikes of any consequence."[2] In this connection, Mr. Boris Emmet is quoted: "The Stove Founders' National Defence Association has now a membership of 73, of which 72 maintain full union conditions in their shops. The conference agreements are unique in the sense that not once in the 26 years of their existence did there arise any question which proved impossible of solution. Most delicate and vital problems, such as the regulation of apprenticeship, introduction of labor-saving machinery, limitation of output, wages, etc., have been amicably solved in a manner mutually satisfactory."[3]

Concerning the trade agreement in the glass bottle industry, Mr. Leo Wolman says: "The adherence of the employers to the agreement is easy to explain. In the first place, this system of collective bargaining, by maintaining uniform wage scales and

[1] "The Development of Collective Bargaining on a National Basis," prepared by Carter Goodrich and presented by W. Jett Lauck before the United States Railroad Labor Board.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 16.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

working rules throughout the whole industry has eliminated the objectionable inequalities as between different employers, that are an inevitable accompaniment of a decentralized system of collective bargaining. Second, the history of the agreement has been such as to modify to a considerable degree the attitude of the employers toward their workmen." [1]

The testimony before the Commission on Industrial Relations brought out the fact that in the pottery industry trade agreements had been in operation for fourteen years. One of the commissioners asked Mr. John A. Campbell, president of the Trenton Potteries, this question: "Isn't it true, Mr. Campbell, that under the old conditions you, as an employer, had much wider liberty than now; you were supreme and could dictate and determine any conditions without consulting labor; but now you are, in a measure, strait-jacketed, let me call it; you cannot make a move without consulting labor, and to that degree you have given up a part of your liberty. Has the result justified you in giving up part of your liberty?" To which Mr. Campbell replied: "Well, of course, that statement of yours will have to be modified a little. While you might be entirely independent, at the same time, you were certainly in hot water a good portion of the time. You paid for your independence. It was a sort of hot-water independence." [2]

In this connection, Mr. Wm. M. Leiserson, Impartial Chairman of the Rochester Clothing Market, says: "Employers in Chicago and Rochester, who have within the last year or two entered into collective bargaining arrangements with the union of clothing workers, have stated that the production per man an hour in their shops has actually increased under this arrangement, although this was a time when most other industries have been suffering from curtailment of production." [3]

Collective bargaining may not only raise the morale of the workers, it may help to increase the efficiency of the employer. As a result of extensive investigation, a committee of the Federated American Engineering Societies,[4] of which Mr. Herbert Hoover was president, recently declared that at present *industry is 75 per cent inefficient, of which labor is responsible for 25 per cent, and management is responsible for 50 per cent.* That is to say, the employers are twice as responsible for inefficiency as are the workers.

[1] "The Development of Collective Bargaining on a National Basis," prepared by Carter Goodrich and presented by W. Jett Lauck before the United States Railroad Labor Board, p. 17.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 18.
[3] "Annals of the American Academy," Sept., 1920, p. 45.
[4] Digest in U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Monthly Labor Review*, Sept., 1921, pp. 493-503. The full report is soon to be published by McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York City.

## AUTOCRACY AND EFFICIENCY

We have assumed that autocracy is efficient. "There is a common superstitious belief," says Mr. Leiserson, "that democracy is always less efficient than autocracy, and therefore industrial efficiency is bound to suffer to the extent that democracy is introduced into industry. To the boss, the foreman, the superintendent or the employer, whose word has been law to his employees, it may appear most absurdly inefficient that he should have to discuss his orders with his employees and consult them about his policies. But when we remember that it has been his rule that brought us opposition to machinery and improved methods from the workers, restriction of output, strikes and lockouts, labor turnover of 400 or 500 per cent and more, and the great decrease in production that most industries now suffer, it must be quite plain that there is nothing efficient about autocratic control of industry." [1]

Mr. Felix Frankfurter, formerly Chairman of the War Labor Policies Board, has expressed the opinion that: "What American business needs is a substitution of the processes of law and order for the present oscillation between anarchy and autocracy by which it is too largely governed. Not until we constitutionalize industry shall we approach aright our industrial questions. Not until those principles which we have proved and tested and established in our political life are transferred, with the necessary adaption to our industrial life, can we really deal with any permanence with the questions which the war has left as legacies to social agencies and the country at large." [2]

[1] "Annals of American Academy," Sept., 1920, pp. 47, 48.
[2] Quoted in Lionel D. Edie, "Current Social and Industrial Forces," pp. 324, 325.

# II: THE UNION SHOP

Many employers who recognize the right of labor to organize and to bargain collectively are unwilling to recognize or to deal with national unions. They have installed shop committees or company unions. In some instances employment is refused to men who are known to be members of a national union, in other cases no attention whatever is paid to membership in national unions. Some employers are convinced that the interests of workers and employers alike are better protected by collective bargaining through company unions, rather than through national unions. Unfortunately, however, some employers are installing company unions merely as the most effective way of fighting national unions. They regard collective bargaining as an infringement upon their rights, but choose company unions as the lesser of two evils.

Company unions do offer a medium for collective bargaining and seem to be a step in the right direction. It is true, however, that they are too often under the domination of the employer and lack independence and power. Ultimate power and final veto are usually reserved by the management. Company unions are often paternalistic in their origin and are dependent upon the benevolence of the employer. They often lack security and permanence, due to the fact that should this employer die or should the business change hands the whole scheme may be scrapped by the new employer. Company unions tend to make the employees of a given shop contented so long as their own interests are safeguarded, and indifferent to the welfare of workers in other shops. This tends to break the solidarity and common action of the employees in a given industry.

## CONCENTRATION OF CONTROL

There is another important reason why company unions are not an adequate channel for the most effective collective bargaining. The policies of employers are not always determined separately for each shop or plant. In many cases there is concentration of control. The Commission on Industrial Relations found that: "A careful and conservative study shows that the corporations controlled by six financial groups and affiliated interests employ

2,651,684 wage earners and have a total capitalization of $19,875,200,000. These six financial groups control 28 per cent of the total number of wage earners engaged in the industries covered by the report of our investigation. The Morgan-First National Bank group alone controls corporations employing 785,499 wage earners." [1]

In addition to this concentration of capital and the power of the bankers, the position of the employer is made stronger by the existence of employers' associations in most industries. Through these associations of employers, common policies are often determined and great pressure is brought to bear upon the individual employer to stand by the common decision. Mutual help is given in event of labor disputes. The American Employers' Association provides that "in the event of a strike or similar trouble, financial support should be given to the one afflicted, and also moral support. This is an important factor in the hour of trouble." [2]

Under such circumstances it is difficult or impossible for the employees of a single shop to bargain on an equal basis with their employer. The Final Report of the Commission on Industrial Relations says: "To suggest that labor unions can be effective if organized on less than a national scale seems to ignore entirely the facts and trend of present-day American business. There is no line of organized industry in which individual establishments can act independently. Ignoring for the time the centralization of control and ownership, and also the almost universal existence of employers' associations, the mere fact of competition would render ineffective any organization of employees which was limited to a single establishment. Advance in labor conditions must proceed with a fair degree of uniformity throughout any line of industry." [3]

Mr. V. Everit Macy, former Chairman of the Ship Building Labor Adjustment Board, says: "Nothing but discord and anarchy results from the independent action of shop committees or local unions. The national unions, like the national association of employers, can view policies from a national standpoint. They have greater responsibilities, and, therefore, give all questions more careful thought before acting. Local organizations cannot long survive if they act without the approval of the national bodies. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance to strengthen the hands of the responsible trade union officials." [4]

Mr. Herbert Hoover recently emphasized the fact that "nation-

[1] Senate Document No. 415, 64th Congress, p. 80.
[2] Quoted in the *American Federationist*, Feb., 1921, p. 114.
[3] Page 65.
[4] "The Development of Collective Bargaining on a National Basis," p. 34.

wide organization of labor is essential in order to cope with the unfair employers."[1] Chief Justice Taft has said: "Labor unions have been necessary to secure to the individual working man an opportunity to deal with his employer on an equality and free from the duress of immediate want of a daily wage."[2] Some years ago President Roosevelt declared: "I believe emphatically in organized labor. I believe in organization of wage workers. Organization is one of the laws of our social and economic development at this time."[3] Professor Edwin R. A. Seligman says: "The individual workman is nowadays helpless against the typical employer. His only hope lies in association. Freedom of contract is illusory because of the self-evident inequality. The trades union is an attempt to restore to the individual as a member of the group the equality which has been lost through the transition from small-scale to large-scale industry. The trades union is as inevitable a product of modern economic life as the corporation."[4]

The union shop[5] offers the most effective form of collective bargaining for the protection of the workers, for the building up of morale, and consequently, for the maximum efficiency of industry.

## OBJECTIONS TO THE UNION SHOP

To catalog all of the objections to the union shop would require much more space than we have at our disposal.[6] Perhaps the most serious of these objections may be grouped under four general headings.

First, the weaknesses and faults of the unions and of union members. A strong case may be made at this point. The unions do have many weaknesses. These weaknesses are constantly being given wide publicity by the opponents of the unions. There is no doubt that some union men have been and are guilty of many of the charges made against them, including graft, bribery, corruption, violence, intimidation, breach of contract, deliberate restriction of output, loafing on the job, and general indifference to the welfare of the industry.

[1] *Industrial Management*, April 1, 1921, p. 228.
[2] "The Trade Union as the Basis for Collective Bargaining," p. 13.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 11.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 81.
[5] A union shop is one in which wages, hours and working conditions are determined by an agreement between the employer and representatives of the union. Some union shops employ only union members. Other union shops employ non-union men as well. Some union men are employed in non-union shops. The test as to whether a shop is union or non-union is whether or not the employer recognizes and deals with the union.
[6] For a lengthy discussion of the objections to unions, see the "Open Shop Encyclopedia for Debaters," published by the National Association of Manufacturers, 30 Church Street, New York, 247 pages.

A second objection to the union shop is that unions tend to deprive the individual worker of his personal freedom, and to dictate as to where he may work and as to his wages, hours and working conditions. Some employers who are opposed to the union are much concerned about the freedom of the individual worker and seek to save him from the dictation of the union. They maintain that where agreements are made between the managers and representatives of the union the freedom of the non-union worker is interfered with.

A third objection is that the union shop tends to deprive the employer of his liberty of action. In the union shop the management is compelled to consult representatives of the union on various matters. To the employer who has been accustomed to "run his own business" such interference by representatives of the union is irritating.

A fourth objection is that the unions represent an undue concentration of labor power and are therefore a menace to public welfare. Many unions possess enormous power and sometimes do not hesitate to use this power for selfish ends, at the expense of the general public. It is also maintained that unions tend to emphasize class differences and to accentuate the class struggle.

# III: THE OPEN SHOP MOVEMENT

Based upon one or more of these objections to the union shop, an open shop movement is sweeping across the country. Since there is much confusion concerning the use of the terms "open shop" and "closed shop," let us analyze these terms. The New Jersey Chamber of Commerce has listed nine varieties of open and closed shops, as follows: (1) closed anti-union shop, (2) preferential anti-union shop, (3) open non-union shop without shop committee, (4) open non-union shop with shop committee, (5) open indirect union shop, (6) open union shop, (7) preferential union shop, (8) closed union shop of an open union, (9) closed union shop of a closed union.

It will thus be seen that the present open shop movement for a shop in which men are employed without reference to membership or non-membership in the union *ignores the vital issue.* In such an open shop the employer may or may not deal with the union. The terms "open shop" and "closed shop" are indefinite and misleading and *should not be used without designating the kind of shop really meant.* This point was strongly emphasized by the Commission on Industrial Relations, as follows: "Whereas the commission finds that the terms 'open shop' and 'closed shop' have each a double meaning, and should never be used without telling which meaning is intended, the double meaning consisting in that they may mean either union or non-union: Therefore, for the purposes of this report, be it resolved that the Commission on Industrial Relations will not use the terms 'open shop' and 'closed shop' but in lieu thereof will use 'union shop' and 'non-union shop.'" [1]

## WORDS OF DISAPPROVAL

At the present time those employers who are seeking to cripple or to destroy effective unions are making their attack under the guise of a movement for the open shop. Their method is to advocate a shop in which men are employed without regard to membership or non-membership in the union, their real purpose often is to make ineffective all union activity. This fact was brought out

[1] Page 265.

by a manufacturer, Mr. Oliver T. Remmer, in speaking before the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, concerning an open shop resolution: "Why doesn't the resolution plainly say what it means, instead of by deceptive language claim to stand for the utopian, when its real purpose is to suppress organized labor? Why does it not get on all fours and say so, calling a spade a spade?" [1]

Another employer, Mr. Ernest G. Draper, President of the American Creosoting Co., in a letter to the *Weekly Review,* said concerning the open shop drive: "If we are unprejudiced, then, we can conclude with perfect truth that the fight against the closed shop as such is no fight at all. Can we predict that the activity of the open-shop campaigners will cease when the absurdity of their purpose is disclosed? Of some of the fairer employers, yes. But of the others, no. They are out to crack organized labor and to crack it wide open. They will do it carefully, secretly perhaps, with the aid of any convenient slogan. But they will do it, if they can." [2]

Ex-President Taft recently pointed out that: "It is the custom of Bourbon employers engaged in fighting labor unionism to the death to call a closed non-union shop an open shop and to call the movement to kill unionism an open-shop movement. This is a deceitful misuse of the term." [3]

The National Catholic Welfare Council says in this connection: "The 'open shop' drive masks under such names as 'the American Plan' and hides behind the pretense of American freedom. Yet its real purpose is to destroy all effective labor unions, and thus subject the working people to the complete domination of the employers." [4] A further statement issued by the National Catholic Welfare Council says: "In general, few if any of the organizations that have declared in favor of the 'open shop' avow their attitude toward collective bargaining. This is the vital issue. Not only has no 'open shop' organization declared that the 'open shop' employer would deal with the union, but every such organization that has confessed its attitude on this subject, has admitted that this practice would not be tolerated. Up to the present, no authorized representative of an 'open shop' organization has denied that collective bargaining with the union is inconsistent with the 'open shop.'" [5]

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has issued a statement in which it is declared that: "The relations between employers and workers throughout the United States are

[1] Quoted in Savel Zimand, "The Open Shop Drive," p. 11.
[2] The *Weekly Review,* January 12, 1921, p. 34.
[3] The Baltimore *News,* Feb. 5, 1921.
[4] Quoted in "The Open Shop Drive," p. 45.
[5] *Ibid.,* p. 46.

seriously affected at this moment by a campaign which is being conducted for the open shop policy—the so-called American Plan of Employment. These terms are now being frequently used to designate establishments that are definitely anti-union. Obviously, a shop of this kind is not an open shop but a closed shop—closed against members of labor unions."

## REFUSAL OF RECOGNITION

Even where the open shop movement is not a conscious attempt to destroy the unions, wherever it is opposed to recognition of unions, its actual effects, when successful, are to cripple or to destroy the unions. "I am not antagonizing unions," said Judge E. H. Gary, of the United States Steel Corporation. "I am not saying that they have not a perfect right to form unions, of course they have." The United States Steel Corporation maintains that it does not antagonize unions. It simply refuses to confer with representatives of unions or in any way to recognize the existence of unions.

Concerning the testimony of Mr. Eugene G. Grace, President of the Bethlehem Steel Co., before the Lockwood Investigating Committee of the New York State Legislature, the New York *World* made the comment that the admission had been forced "that he, personally, the Bethlehem Steel Co., the Bethlehem subsidiaries, and practically all the steel interests of the country are endeavoring to kill off union labor and to create non-union shops if human ingenuity can do it."[1]

## SPIES AND INTIMIDATION

In their fight against unions many of the employers who are backing the open shop movement are resorting to under-cover methods—spies, blacklists and discharging employees for union membership. Extensive investigations made by the Cabot Fund, by the Committee of Enquiry of the Interchurch World Movement, and by other agencies, have proved conclusively the widespread use of industrial spies.

The Interchurch Report on the Steel Strike says: "The steel industry was under the domination of a policy whose aim was to keep out labor unions. In pursuit of this policy, blacklists were used, workmen were discharged for union affiliation, 'under-cover men' and 'labor detectives' were employed and efforts were made to influence the local press, pulpit and police authorities."[2]

[1] Quoted in the *Literary Digest*, Jan. 1, 1921.
[2] "Report on the Steel Strike of 1919," pp. 14, 15.

Eighty-six pages of the second volume of the Interchurch Report are devoted to a citation of the evidence of labor espionage in various steel plants.[1]

Investigators for the Cabot Fund for Industrial Research of Boston found that industrial espionage "operates through the secret service departments of great corporations, the railroads, the United States Steel Corporation, the Western Union Telegraph Company and like corporations. It operates through the spy services of employers' associations; The National Erectors' Association, the National Manufacturers' Association, The National Founders' Association." [2]

The evidence is beyond dispute that certain groups are attempting to deal with the faults of trade unions by a policy of suppression under the guise of a movement for the open shop and with the aid of labor spies, blacklists and intimidation.

## THE FOLLY OF REPRESSION

Attempts on the part of employers to destroy the unions by fair means or foul are foolish and are sure to have vicious results. It is utterly impossible to crush organized labor. Such a movement may seem to succeed for a time. But with the spread of education and the growth of democracy, workers cannot long be kept from combining for mutual defence. It is only a question of time until they gain sufficient collective strength to resist the tyranny of employers.

If employers who are seeking to destroy unions were wise, they would recognize that a policy of repression is futile and can only lead to violence and destruction. History has many lessons to teach at this point.

About a hundred years ago the employers of England tried to destroy trade unions. In 1799 and 1800 they succeeded in passing the Combination Acts, which expressly penalized all combinations whatsoever. "Under this Act any workman who combined with any other workman in order to get an increase of wages or a decrease of hours was liable to be brought up before any single magistrate—it might be one of the employers for whom he was working—and on conviction be sent forthwith to jail for three months, or to hard labour in the House of Corrections for two." [3]

As early as 1786 five London bookbinders were sentenced to two years' imprisonment for leading a strike to reduce hours from

[1] "Public Opinion and the Steel Strike," pp. 1-86.
[2] "The Labor Spy," a 72-page pamphlet published by the *New Republic*, 421 West 21st St., New York, price 15 cents.
[3] Hammond, "The Town Labourer," p. 120.

twelve to eleven.[1] Seventeen tanners at Bermondsey in 1834 were sentenced to imprisonment for the offence of leaving their work unfinished.[2] In 1834 seven Dorchester laborers, including two itinerant preachers, were given the monstrous sentence of seven years' transportation to Botany Bay for the sole crime of administering oaths as a part of the ritual of "the Friendly Society of Agricultural Labourers." "No accusation was made, and no evidence preferred against them, of anything worse than the playing with oaths. Not only were they guiltless of any intimidation or outrage, but they had not even struck or presented any application for higher wages." [3]

During the great strike of the miners in 1844 Lord Londonderry in his dual capacity as mine-owner and Lord-Lieutenant of Durham County, not only superintended the wholesale eviction of strikers from their homes, but also ordered the resident merchants in "his town of Seaham" to refuse to supply provisions to the strikers, on pain of forfeiting his protection.[4]

For many decades in England public opinion was strongly in favor of suppressing the unions. Lord Shaftesbury, champion of factory legislation, expressed the hope that "the working people may be emancipated from the tightest thraldom they have yet endured. All the single despots, and all the aristocracies that ever were or ever will be, are as puffs of wind compared with these tornadoes, the Trade Unions." [5] John Bright thought that "combinations, in the long run, must be as injurious to the workman as to the employer against whom he is contending." [6] Wilberforce was strongly in favor of the Combination Acts forbidding trade unions. Dr. Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester, publicly suggested the village horsepond as a fit destination for union organizers.[7]

In England for many decades every possible means was used to destroy trade unions. Employers, government officials, journalists and clergymen, agreed that organizations of workers were dangerous and every possible legal and economic weapon was used against such combinations. All of this effort at suppression was unsuccessful. The tide has ebbed and flowed but on the whole there has been a steady growth in the strength of trade unions in England. Happily a change of sentiment has now taken place. The right of workers to organize and to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing is rarely challenged. Collec-

[1] Webb, "History of Trades Unions," rev. ed. 1920, p. 79.
[2] Ibid., p. 143.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 146.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 166.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 293.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 293.
[7] *Ibid.*, p 332.

tive bargaining has largely replaced individual bargaining in all of the great industries and a majority of employers greatly prefer to deal with the unions rather than to make individual bargains with each of their workers.

In Russia we find an excellent illustration of the consequences of repression. The attitude of the former imperial government toward all movements of workers is well known. Suppression was the recognized policy. Imprisonment, banishment and execution were the weapons used. With what results? An explosion that blew away the old régime and has all but ruined the industry of Russia. Recent happenings in Russia cannot be understood apart from a remembrance of the decades and centuries of repression and persecution of the masses.

## TENDENCY IN AMERICA

Since the war there has been an increasing tendency in the United States to depend upon repression as the weapon against unrest. Mr. Sidney A. Reeve has expressed the opinion that: "The whole policy of the day is to rely upon repressing by force a discontent which, driven by expanding world commercialism, is rising, the world over, as naturally, relentlessly and uncontrollably as the tide under the pull of the moon." [1]

Much of the violence displayed in labor disputes in this country has been the result of attempted suppression of trade unions. A notable recent illustration is to be found in the coal mines of West Virginia. Throughout several counties the miners are absolutely forbidden to join the union. Anti-union contracts are required by many owners. These contracts, referred to by the union as "Yellow Dog" contracts, bind the miners not to join any labor organization or in any way "to aid, encourage or approve" the formation of such an organization.[2]

Under these contracts it is unlawful for the union members or organizers to ask a miner who has signed such a contract to join the union. The courts have held that under such circumstances to ask a man to join the union is to seek to persuade him to break his contract, and hence is unlawful. The courts are therefore granting injunctions against the United Mine Workers of America, forbidding them to solicit members among those miners who have signed these contracts. The Supreme Court of the United States has upheld the validity of such injunctions. This

[1] "Modern Economic Tendencies," p. 721.

[2] See Winthrop D. Lane, "Civil War in West Virginia," p. 64, for a full account of the facts in the case—published by B. W. Huebsch, New York, price 50 cents.

has created a situation where, in the words of Professor John R. Commons, "persuasion to join a union is as unlawful as violence." [1]

What are social consequences of this suppression of the unions? The answer is: bitterness, violence, murder, civil war, a "three-day battle," when it is estimated that 100,000 shots were exchanged, martial law!

Repression may seem to succeed for a time. It did in Russia. But sooner or later it will fail. And then the flood. In so far as the present open shop movement is directed toward the suppression or destruction of the unions, it is short-sighted and its consequences will be vicious. Suppression is not the way out of our present difficulties. Such a procedure can only lead us deeper and deeper into the morass of bitterness and inefficiency.

## DEALING WITH FAULTS OF UNIONS

The present writer wishes to emphasize the fact that he has not the slightest desire to overlook or excuse the faults and excesses of the unions. He does believe, however, that attempted suppression is not the way to deal with the faults of the unions, some of which are undoubtedly serious. The proper procedure to follow, in his opinion, is the correction of the faults of the unions, full recognition of the unions and friendly coöperation with them. Patience, sympathy and persistence of effort are required.

In this connection the Bureau of State Research of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce says: "The unions, indeed, are not ideal, but neither are the individual employers nor the employers' associations. The defects of the unions need not be countenanced, but with proper effort could surely be eliminated. By getting together in a round-table conference the employers and the union leaders could well point out to each other the shortcomings of their practices and argue the matter out until mutually satisfactory improvements were agreed upon. Surely, no improvement in union practices could be secured by ignoring them or still more by throwing bricks at them whenever a favorable occasion presents itself." [2]

In dealing with this point, Henry White says: "The labor movement possesses such elements of strength that its deficiencies can be candidly admitted in order that they may be more readily corrected. To seek to destroy unions because of their defects would be like attempting to abolish government because of its

[1] Quoted, *Ibid.*, p. 10.
[2] Quoted in "The Trade Union as the Basis for Collective Bargaining," pp. 70, 71.

abuses. The unions with all their faults represent a forward stride to the human race. They cultivate a spirit of self-reliance and mutual assistance which ought to more than compensate for their faults." [1]

From the many testimonies in similar vein, we choose two others. In an address before the Boston Chamber of Commerce last year, Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce, said: "The trade unions of the United States have conferred such essential services upon their membership and upon the community that their real values are not to be overlooked or destroyed. They can fairly claim great credit for the abolition of sweat-shops, for recognition of fairer hours in industry, reduction of overstrain, employment under more healthful conditions, and many other reforms. These gains have been made through collective bargains and part of the difficulties of the labor situation today is the bitterness with which these gains were accomplished. In my own experience in industry I have always found that a frank and friendly acceptance of the unions' agreements, while still maintaining the open shop, has led to constructive relationship and mutual interest." [2]

Justice Brandeis of the United States Supreme Court has said: "Most people admit the immense service which the labor unions have rendered to the community during the last twenty years in raising of wages, shortening of the hours of labor, bettering of conditions under which labor is performed, and protecting women and children from excessive or ill-timed work; but the services which the labor unions can render in the future are even greater than they have rendered in the past. The employer needs the unions 'to stay him from the fall of vanity'; the employees need them for their protection; the community needs them to raise the level of the citizen. Strong, stable trades unions can best serve these ends. Peace and prosperity, therefore, are not to be attained by any attempt to weaken trades unions. Our hope lies rather in their growing strength." [3]

[1] Quoted in "The Trade Union as the Basis for Collective Bargaining," p. 93.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 13.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 37.

# IV: THE APPLICATION OF CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES

There are certain Christian principles that need to be brought to bear upon this issue. According to the teaching of Jesus, the ultimate goal of endeavor is the creation of a society in which is afforded the maximum opportunity for the development and enrichment of every human personality; the supreme motive is that of love and good-will and the desire to aid in the creation of a society in which all may share in the good life; the dominant method is that of overcoming evil with good and of friendly coöperation for the common good.

If these Christian principles are applied in the present industrial struggle, what decisions will be reached? Can we not agree upon the following?

(1) *Exploitation Must Cease.* There can be no doubt that at the present time large numbers of the poorer and weaker workers are being exploited by the strong. They are laboring unduly hard without receiving a just share of the products of their toil. In this day of huge corporations and concentration of control in industry, is it not necessary for the workers to unite in collective action in order to avoid exploitation? If it is a Christian duty for the strong to bear the burdens of the weak, should not our sympathies and efforts be on the side of the exploited and disinherited of the earth?

(2) *Every person should be afforded an adequate opportunity for self-development and self-expression.* Such an opportunity is not afforded to thousands of workers at the present time, due to insufficient income, unduly long hours of labor for many and forced unemployment for others, unwholesome living conditions and other unfavorable factors. Lack of material advantages is not the only barrier to self-development. Thousands of workers have little or no voice in deciding the conditions of their working lives. Is it not true that autocratic control in industry is a denial of the right of the workers to an adequate degree of self-determination and self-expression? Is not collective bargaining a medium through which the workers may express themselves? Does it not make possible a larger degree of freedom for the workers?

(3) *Production for social use rather than for individual profit and power.* The desire to serve should be the dominant motive of all who engage in industry. In the light of this principle, shall we not condemn the subordination of the well-being of the workers to dividends and profits? Shall we not condemn dishonesty and graft, whether on the part of employer or union leader? Shall we not condemn deliberate restriction of output for selfish purposes, whether by the employer or worker? Shall we not condemn the closed union, wherein, by one means or another, membership is restricted to a chosen few? Shall we not condemn the shop, where, in order that the employer may retain autocratic control, employment is denied to active members of unions?

(4) *Friendly coöperation should replace unrestricted competition.* Bitterness, intimidation, violence, and breach of contract, violate fundamental Christian principles and should not be tolerated. The present policy of unrestricted competition and commercial anarchy should be replaced by a policy of friendly coöperation, built around accepted rules of law and order. Industry, as well as government, should be based upon a constitution. "We, the people" should determine what this constitution is to be.

In conclusion, can we not agree that while collective bargaining is not a universal panacea for all of our industrial ills, since we have giant corporations and highly centralized control of industry, collective bargaining through national unions is needed for the adequate protection and development of the workers, for efficiency in production for social use rather than for individual profit and power, for the extension of democracy in industry and the building up of an industrial constitution as the basis for coöperative effort in the service of all?

Each, 32 pages. Ten cents net.

GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY, PUBLISHERS
244 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK

No. 1—INDUSTRIAL FACTS, BY KIRBY PAGE.

Concrete data concerning such industrial problems as concentration of wealth and control, poverty, low wages, unemployment, long hours.

Brief descriptions of such proposed solutions as welfare work, employees' representation, open shop campaign, trade unions, the coöperative movement, labor party, socialism, syndicalism, national guild movement.

Statement of Christian principles that have a bearing upon these problems.

10,000 copies sold within three months.

No. 2—COLLECTIVE BARGAINING, BY KIRBY PAGE.

An ethical evaluation of some phases of trade unionism and the open shop movement.

No. 3—FELLOWSHIP, BY BASIL MATHEWS AND HARRY BISSEKER.

Preface by Sherwood Eddy.

A consideration of fellowship as a means of building the Christian social order. This pamphlet emphasizes the importance of group discussion in seeking light upon industrial problems and the need for closer coöperation between those of like purpose.

---

Persons desiring quantities of these pamphlets for use in classes, discussion groups or open forums, or for distribution among their friends, may secure them at the rate of 70 cents for ten copies, or $6.00 per hundred, postpaid, from Kirby Page, 311 Division Avenue, Hasbrouck Heights, New Jersey.